

PLANNING COMMISSION  
**August 26, 2015**  
Meeting Minutes

The Planning Commission of Monroe County conducted a meeting on **Wednesday, August 26, 2015**, beginning at 10:01 a.m. at the Marathon Government Center, 2798 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL** by Gail Creech

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Denise Werling, Chair	Present
William Wiatt, Vice Chair	Present
Elizabeth Lustberg	Present
Ron Miller	Present
Beth Ramsay-Vickrey	Present

**STAFF**

Mayte Santamaria, Sr. Director of Planning and Environmental Resources	Present
Steve Williams, Assistant County Attorney	Present
John Wolfe, Planning Commission Counsel	Present
Mike Roberts, Senior Administrator, Environmental Resources	Present
Rey Ortiz, Planning & Biological Plans Examiner Supervisor	Present
Tiffany Stankiewicz, Development Administrator	Present
Emily Schemper, Comprehensive Planning Manager	Present
Kevin Bond, Planning & Development Review Manager	Present
Matt Coyle, Principal Planner	Present
Devin Rains, Senior Planner	Present
Tom Broadrick, Senior Planner	Present
Gail Creech, Planning Commission Coordinator	Present

**COUNTY RESOLUTION 131-91 APPELLANT TO PROVIDE RECORD FOR APPEAL**

County Resolution 131-92 was read into the record by Mr. Wolfe.

**SUBMISSION OF PROPERTY POSTING AFFIDAVITS AND PHOTOGRAPHS**

Gail Creech confirmed receipt of all necessary paperwork.

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Ms. Creech stated that the applicant of Item 5 has requested that this item be continued to the September 30, 2015, Planning Commission meeting. **Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to continue Item 5 to the September 30, 2015, Planning Commission meeting.**

**Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**SWEARING OF COUNTY STAFF**

County staff members were sworn in by Mr. Wolfe.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion: Commissioner Lustberg made a motion to approve the July 29, 2015, meeting minutes. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**MEETING**

**New Items:**

**1.A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND FINALIZE THE RANKING OF APPLICATIONS IN THE DWELLING UNIT ALLOCATION SYSTEM** FOR April 14, 2015, THROUGH July 13, 2015, ROGO (4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER YEAR 23). ALLOCATION AWARDS WILL BE ALLOCATED FOR ALL UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY, (File 2014-153)

(10:04 a.m.) Ms. Stankiewicz presented the staff report. Ms. Stankiewicz reported that market rate Lower Keys applicants ranked 1 through 11, Big Pine/No Name applicants ranked 1 through 3 subject to mitigation availability at the time of permitting, and Upper Keys applicants ranked 1 through 10 were being recommended for approval. There were no affordable housing applicants.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey commented that the ranking system should be looked into to consider applying negative points to those persons who own multiple properties in the County because of the concern that single-property owners could be placed behind real estate speculators. Mr. Wolfe responded that can be looked into, but it is doubtful there is any solution to that scenario.

**Motion: Commissioner Lustberg made a motion for approval. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**2.A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND FINALIZE THE RANKING OF APPLICATIONS IN THE DWELLING UNIT ALLOCATION SYSTEM** FOR April 14, 2015, THROUGH July 13, 2015, NROGO (4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER YEAR 23). ALLOCATION AWARDS WILL BE ALLOCATED FOR ALL UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY. (File 2014-154)

(10:08 a.m.) Ms. Stankiewicz clarified that this is only a report for NROGO. Ms. Stankiewicz recommended approval for the one NROGO applicant's allocation award to be made.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed. Ms. Santamaria clarified for Commissioner Miller that this award is for the second story of the building owned by the applicant. The downstairs of the building already has NROGO.

**Motion: Commissioner Miller made a motion to approve. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**3.AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS** AMENDING THE LIVABLE COMMUNIKEYS PROGRAM MASTER PLAN FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF BIG PINE KEY AND NO NAME KEY AMENDING THE TIER DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY OWNED BY LONGSTOCK II, LLC, HAVING REAL ESTATE NUMBERS 00300090-000000; 00300180-000000; 00300590-000000 AND 00300670-000000 FROM TIER I TO TIER III ON FIGURE 2.1 (TIER MAP FOR BIG PINE KEY AND NO NAME KEY); PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF INCONSISTENT PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR THE TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY; PROVIDING FOR THE FILING WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND PROVIDING FOR THE INCLUSION IN THE MONROE COUNTY 2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

(File 2015-116)

**4.AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS** AMENDING THE TIER OVERLAY DISTRICT DESIGNATION FROM TIER I TO TIER III FOR PROPERTY OWNED BY LONGSTOCK II, LLC; LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4 AND 5, BLOCK 1; LOTS 1 THROUGH 18 BLCOK 2, SAM-N-JOE SUBDIVISION PLAT BOOK 3 PAGE 76 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY FLORIDA AND LOTS 1 THROUGH 9, BLOCK 3, DARIOS SUBDIVISION PLAT BOOK 3 PAGE 92 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY FLORIDA; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE TIER OVERLAY DISTRICT MAP; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(File 2015-035)

(10:09 a.m.) Mr. Wolfes stated that a request was made to hear Items 3 and 4 together for convenience, but there will be separate motions made.

Mr. Roberts presented the staff report. Mr. Roberts reported that these two agenda items will be heard together because the comprehensive plan has to be amended through the Livable CommuniKeys Plan (LCP) before the tier overlay district map can be amended, which is part of the code. The staff report and staff presentation are essentially the same for both, but there are two different maps that have to be amended. The first item is the map in the LCP. The standards by which the tiers are designated in the LCP are based on the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and the LCP. The proposal is to change Figure 2.1 on the map from Tier I to Tier III. The tier designation criteria found in the HCP are based on habitat quality of the properties, as well as the deer density and the deer utilization of the properties. Mr. Roberts pointed out that, unique to

Big Pine/No Name Key, there is an H value associated with the tier designation. Other than that one difference, the criteria is similar to what is found in the tier designation criteria, the comp plan and the code for the remainder of the Keys.

Mr. Roberts explained that Tier I criteria is lands that are high quality Key deer habitat, generally representing large contiguous patches of native vegetation that provide habitat for other protected species as well; Tier II is primarily scattered canal lots and fragments of environmentally sensitive lands; and Tier III is scattered lots within already heavily developed areas that provide little habitat value to the Key deer and other protected species. Mr. Roberts further explained the range of the H values and that they were generated out of the population viability analysis done back in 2004 and 2005. The Lower Keys marsh rabbit habitat is also a criteria, as well as whether or not the property lies within a designated deer corridor. Mr. Roberts showed the maps from Figure 2.2 of the habitat areas as well as the buffers. Ms. Santamaria clarified for Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey that the deer corridor that appear to be over the avenues is designated as Tier I. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the deer corridor mapped in the HCP is different from the corridor that is mapped in the LCP and was adopted. The subject property lies to the east of the deer corridor shown in the HCP and lies to the south of the area on the deer density map that is designated as having both a higher deer density and a lesser deer density. Commissioner Miller feels the maps should contain a greater level of detail regarding the deer corridors and deer density.

Mr. Roberts continued to report that another criteria looked at is house density. The most heavily weighted criteria for the development of the tier designation for Big Pine and No Name Keys is based on the harvest grid. The subject parcels fall within the area of a lower value for deer. Ground level photographs of the property were shown. Mr. Roberts stated that the Seahorse RV Campground has 135 recognized dwelling units, the majority of which are RVs on the property. A number of those have already been moved off the property by the property owner. The property is completely scarified with very little habitat other than some canopy trees that remain within the confines of the park. Mr. Roberts showed the proposed tier overlay district map amendment. Mr. Roberts noted that staff has contacted the US Fish & Wildlife Service due to concerns raised at the DRC meeting. Staff has received an e-mail from Fish & Wildlife stating that they concur with the proposed tier designation change, but have recommended that the qualitative analysis or qualitative assessment of the tier overlays be highlighted rather than focusing on the H value. Commissioner Miller asked to receive a copy of that email.

Chair Werling asked for public comment.

Deb Curlee, board member of the Key Deer Protection Alliance (KDPA), stated that in July of this year the KDPA wrote a letter to the DRC regarding this proposed map amendment, a copy of which has been given to the Commissioners. That letter asked Planning Department staff to solicit input from Fish & Wildlife regarding this issue. The KDPA has not seen the response from Fish & Wildlife. Ms. Curlee asked the Commissioners to take the following comments into consideration prior to making a decision on Agenda Item 3 or Item 4: 1, The Sea Camp change of tier designation did not set a precedent for tier map amendments on Big Pine/No Name Key because it occurred prior to the adoption of the master plan; 2, Based on the science

of the HCP, the Seahorse parcels were correctly classified as Tier I lands; 3, As noted in the staff report, the HCP states the Key deer are wide-ranging and use virtually all of the available habitat in the project area, including developed areas; 4, As noted in the staff report, the master plan for development on Big Pine/No Name Key states the tier boundaries shall be designated using the Big Pine/No Name Key HCP 2005 and the adopted community master plan for Big Pine/No Name Key; 5, All of the data in the HCP support the tier designation of the Seahorse RV Campground as Tier I lands; 6, Staff cannot go back and try to change the scientific findings of the ten-year-old HCP; 7, If staff wants to demonstrate the HCP scientific basis for the Tier I designation of the Seahorse properties was flawed or incorrectly interpreted, then the HCP needs to be formally amended; 8, Amendment of the HCP would require approval by Fish & Wildlife and would utilize a completely different review process than that of the Planning Department; and 9, The science of the HCP cannot be undone with a Monroe County map amendment.

Chair Werling asked for further public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Miller commented that the e-mail from Fish & Wildlife is not an approval, but is basically a preliminary discussion. Ms. Santamaria clarified that Fish & Wildlife does not have to approve the tier amendment or the LCP. Staff is providing them intergovernmental coordination. Staff is looking at this based on the criteria of the comp plan, Florida Statutes and the code, which are the criteria required for changes to the tier maps. The background information for the H value was created with Fish & Wildlife, as well as with Texas A&M, which is why staff reached out to Fish & Wildlife when the KDPA brought this up.

Commissioner Lustberg asked for clarification on why the H values are looked at on Big Pine/No Name Key and not just the tier designations, as is done in the rest of the Keys. Mr. Roberts explained that the point behind the e-mail from Fish & Wildlife is that while two of those parcels have Tier II-type H values, the actual qualitative assessment of those properties fit more within a Tier III criteria than they did Tier II. The point of the e-mail is that Fish & Wildlife would support the recommendation provided that the qualitative assessment of those parcels is fleshed out. Mr. Roberts further explained that ideally the criteria would match, that a high H value would equate to high deer density and high deer habitat value, but that correlation does not hold completely true in all areas of Big Pine/No Name Key. Commissioner Lustberg voiced concern that these extra protections exist in Big Pine/No Name that do not match up with the other criteria.

Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey questions whether the LCP should be reopened to make sure those maps match the HCP maps. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey then asked whether future extra protections that have been placed on Big Pine and No Name Key will be moved to other islands since the deer are now located on other islands that were originally part of the deer's habitat. Mr. Roberts deferred that question to Key Deer Refuge staff. Mr. Roberts then clarified that both of the corridor maps in the staff report and the presentation are from the HCP. The main difference is that subsequent to the development of the Figure 2.4 corridor map US-1 was improved and the deer underpasses were put in to the east of the subject parcels. Now that primary passageway to the underpass is through the Sands corridor. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey commented that a lot of the properties in the avenues are canal-front lots and asked would they not would actually qualify is Tier II now.

Commissioner Miller stated although a tier change cannot be based on what an owner of a property may or may not do in the future, from the photos it looks like affordable housing exists at this property already. Mr. Wolfe agreed that what an owner may or may not do cannot be considered as part of the tier designation. Commissioner Miller believes that those who arrived at the tier designations were provided with better maps to make those determinations. Commissioner Miller pointed out there are conflicts between the staff report and the criteria for Tier I designations. Ms. Santamaria clarified that the tier overlay district excludes Big Pine and No Name Key and refers back to the HCP, the ITP and the LCP for Big Pine/No Name Key. Commissioner Miller feels this is a political decision not based on science and would rather see this returned back to the people who worked on the tier maps originally. Mr. Williams replied that the process established brings this matter to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Miller reiterated that the e-mail from Fish & Wildlife does not say to change the Tier I designation to Tier III.

Commissioner Wiatt stated he is not willing to entertain a change unless staff believes that the original and current criteria for tier designation was incorrectly applied during the initial tier designation. Ms. Santamaria confirmed that staff feels that this property should have been originally identified as a Tier III property. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey again questioned whether all of the maps should be reopened and some parcels re-designated. Ms. Santamaria noted that the ITP that the County has with Fish & Wildlife ends in 2023. Consideration is being given to amending the HCP, the LCP and the ITP for Big Pine to just focus on CBRS lands that are not within the FEMA program and then everything else would be under the permit referral.

Bryan Hawks, Esquire, present on behalf of the applicant, noted that the subject parcels are scarified and contain no habitat for the deer.

Commissioner Miller commented that parameters used to determine this property was Tier I is a different scenario than what is traditionally thought of as a property that has been scarified and no longer has protections. Commissioner Miller does not believe the Tier I designation was an error. Mr. Roberts explained for Commissioner Wiatt that the original H values were generated from a population viability analysis conducted by researchers with Texas A&M University, which model was used by the County's consultants in the development of the HCP. Commissioner Wiatt asked if staff was not qualified to make the initial interpretation and determination that this property is Tier I, what qualifies staff to make a new and different interpretation of the same criteria and thereby re-designate the property? Mr. Roberts explained that the HCP and the LCP and the criteria discussed relative to the designation of those tiers preceded the actual tier map development. The only tier designations in the HCP are relative to vacant property. The actual development of the County's tier designation map for Big Pine was post production of the HCP and was a public process through workshops, etc.

Ms. Santamaria then clarified for Commissioner Lustberg that the County made the maps using the HCP, which was generated by Texas A&M. Chair Werling pointed out that there was a process whereby a property owner could address their property's tier designation. Commissioner Miller stated he would feel more comfortable if an explanation of how this was created was given to the Commissioners. Mr. Roberts clarified for Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey that the

research by Texas A&M was the population viability analysis, which was taken by the consultant for the County as well as the committee that was generated for the development of the HCP and used as the basis of the HCP. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey believes there are mistakes that need to be corrected in this tier designation map from personally living in the Big Pine and No Name Key area. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey feels that scientific data put through a public forum can result in data that does not match the original data. Ms. Santamaria will provide the Commissioners with more information from Fish & Wildlife on the background of the population viability analysis and harvest grid, how it was calculated and applied, and clarification on their recommendation, if they have any objections to changing the designation from Tier I to Tier III.

**Motion: Commissioner Miller made a motion to continue Item 3 to September 30, 2015. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion: Commissioner Miller made a motion to continue Item 4 to September 30, 2015. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**5. Florida Keys Media, LLC, 830 Crane Boulevard, Sugarloaf Key, mile marker 19:** A public hearing concerning a request for a Major Conditional Use Permit. The requested approval is required for the development of a proposed antenna supporting structure. The subject property is described as a Parcel of land in Section 25, Township 66 South, Range 27 East, Sugarloaf Key, Monroe County, Florida, also known as Block 1, Lot 4, in the unrecorded plat of North Sugarloaf Acres Section One, having real estate number 00117510.000400. (File 2015-085)

This matter was previously continued to September 30, 2015.

**6. Anglers Club Members Association, Inc., 50 Clubhouse Road, Key Largo, Mile Marker C11 off SR905:** A public hearing concerning a request for a time extension to a Major Development Order memorialized by the Zoning Board Resolution #MD No. 32-86 for Anglers Club, Inc. and Bayside Properties, Inc., and is described as parts of Government lots 1 and 2, Anglers Club Subdivision, Section 13, Township 59 South, Range 40 East, Key Largo, Florida, (legal description in metes and bounds is provided in the application/file) having real estate numbers 00080020.000300, 00080020.000272, 00080020.000275, 00080020.000277, 00080020.000278, 00080020.000280, 00080020.000282, 00080020.000285, 00080020.000287, 00080020.000290, and 00080020.000296. (File 2015-107)

(11:09 a.m.) Mr. Ortiz presented the staff report. Mr. Ortiz reported that this is an application for a third time extension to a major development order. The original approval occurred on July 30, 1996. The original application was for 102 units and the applicant has since decreased it to 80 units. There is currently a lot more green space proposed. One of the parcels at this time is in the process of submitting building permit applications. The extension being asked for at this time would expire in 2026. Staff recommends approval of a ten-year extension to the initially

approved major development and final development plan and final community impact statement with the condition that the deadline to complete the project is extended to July 30, 2026. All certificates of occupancy shall be required by the State unless additional time extension is granted.

James Lupino, Esquire, present on behalf of the applicant, stated that the applicant agrees with staff's recommendation. A summary of what has been done in the past ten years was provided to the Commissioners, as well as what is anticipated to be completed in the next ten years. Mr. Ortiz added that he personally conducted a site visit confirming everything in that document. Ms. Santamaria explained that the document contains a large table with all the real estate numbers providing the history of how this was built.

Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey noted that most of the work was done between 1986 and 1989 and the last work was performed in 2002. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey questioned why it will take ten years for only five buildings that remain to be built. Chris Everhart, the general manager and chief operating officer of the Key Largo Angler's Club, was sworn in by Mr. Wolfe. Mr. Everhart explained that it will probably not take ten years to finish building the project out, but the development of the remaining lots has not been pushed too hard because a density reduction was done voluntarily in 1996. The applicant is now trying to select a master planner to help finish the buildout with a well thought out plan. The central portion of the property now contains a large conserved area of almost six acres. Commissioner Lustberg asked staff if everything in the plans still adheres to the current code. Mr. Ortiz explained when the applicant comes in for a building permit staff will make sure that it adheres to the code and the development order in place.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

**Motion: Commissioner Miller made a motion to approve. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**7.PL Ocean Residences, 97801 Overseas Highway, Key Largo, mile marker 98:** A public meeting concerning a request for approval of a proposed development of greater than 20 dwelling units designated as affordable housing, as required by Monroe County Code Section 130-161(a)(6)h. The requested approval is required for the proposed development of 24 attached dwelling units designated as affordable housing. The subject property is described as parcels of land located in Sections 5 and 6, Township 62 South, Range 39 East, Key Largo, Monroe County, Florida, having real estate numbers 00090810.000000, 00090820.000000, 00090840.000000, 00090840.000100, and 00090860.000000.  
(File 2015-049)

(11:21 a.m.) Ms. Schemper presented the staff report. Ms. Schemper clarified that this request is before the Planning Commission today as a result of Section 130-161 of the code, which specifically states that any affordable housing projects that are greater than 20 units need to be approved by a resolution of the Planning Commission. Ms. Schemper reported that this is a proposal for 24 affordable dwelling units and is combined with an overall project that also includes 28 market rate dwelling units. The affordable dwelling units are attached units and

require a minor conditional use permit, which was reviewed by the DRC and is an application that is approved by the Planning Director after review and input by the DRC. The 24 affordable units are intended to serve as employee housing for the nearby Playa Largo hotel. The site for the affordable units is a 4.6 acre site. It has a future land use designation of residential high, a zoning designation of urban residential, and a tier designation of Tier III. There are not specific criteria within Section 130-161. A determination of compliance with all of the land development regulations will be done as part of the conditional use permit review.

Ms. Schemper explained that the principal purpose of the residential high category is to provide for high density single-family, multifamily and institutional residential development, including mobile homes and manufactured housing, located near employment centers. In the urban residential zoning district attached residential dwelling units are permitted with a minor conditional use permit. The combination of the proposed market rate units and the affordable units together come up to a cumulative total of 89 percent of the allowed maximum net density. The applicant does intend to bring in some TDRs for the market rate units. Seven-and-a-half TDRs will be required before a building permit for all of those market rate units can be obtained. The applicant will need to apply for 24 affordable housing ROGO allocations. After approval of their conditional use and review of their building permits the applicant will enter the ROGO application process. Currently there are over 200 affordable housing ROGO allocations available. Staff believes this project furthers Goal 601 of the comp plan and furthers Strategy 4.2 of the Key Largo Livable CommuniKeys Plan, which is to enable and promote the creation of affordable and work force housing. Staff is recommending approval.

Chair Werling asked whether there is an affordable housing mechanism in place on these units since they are for the employees. Ms. Schemper stated whether the Playa Largo hotel provides housing or not, that development is going to create a need for affordable housing. In terms of the ongoing long-term affordability, these units will be deed-restricted just as all other affordables are deed-restricted, but will not be tied to the hotel. Commissioner Lustberg pointed out that deed restrictions are for 99 years. Commissioner Miller questioned whether these units can be used exclusively for the Playa Largo employees under the HUD guidelines. Commissioner Lustberg explained that affordable housing developments that use government tax credits to develop the property have different rules than a private venture. Mr. Williams noted these units are under common ownership by Playa Largo hotel and they are going to rent to their employees. These units will remain as part of the affordable housing deed restriction in the future, but the ownership may change. Mr. Wolfe emphasized all the Planning Commission is being asked to approve today is the affordable housing project, not what the conditions will be for living there. Ms. Schemper added that the deed restrictions will not include any reference to who may or may not live there other than the affordable requirement. Ms. Santamaria explained for Commissioner Miller that this particular approval is simply to approve 20 or more affordable units, but not the income qualifications for the prospective tenants. They are going to be employee housing units, so the tenants have to have 70 percent of their gainful employment and income from Monroe County and they have to meet the income criteria and the units will be deed-restricted 99 years, but that is not part of this approval.

Commissioner Wiatt asked for the rationale behind needing Planning Commission approval to go above 20 affordable housing units. Ms. Santamaria stated that it allows neighbors of a large

complex to have a public process for approval. These employee units are not linked with the Playa Largo project. The project will have to meet the definitions of the code. The conditional use for the hotel has no requirement for affordable housing. Ms. Schemper clarified that the applicants are redeveloping 20 market rate units that previously existed on the subject property, which requires six to be affordable. COs on a proportional number of the affordable units will be required before they can get their COs on the proportional number of the first 20 market rates. The additional 18 affordable units being proposed are purely voluntary affordable units.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

**Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to approve Item 7. Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**8.A scrivener's error** to correct a date on Planning Commission Resolution P43-14, to change an improper date from October 8, 2014 to October 16, 2014.

(11:36 a.m.) Ms. Santamaria stated that the approved site plan for the resolution had an incorrect date that simply needs to be corrected.

**Motion: Commissioner Ramsay-Vickrey made a motion to approve. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMENTS**

Ms. Santamaria reported that the BOCC will start looking at the Land Development Code on September 2, 2015, and October 1, 2015, that the Planning Commission recently passed. Ms. Santamaria invited the Planning Commissioners to attend that meeting. Mr. Williams asked that if two or more Commissioners decided to attend the BOCC meetings, to notify Legal staff so a Sunshine notice can be prepared on their behalf.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Monroe County Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:39 a.m.